



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 14

Bradley D. Lytle
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Fourth Floor
1755 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 22202

JUL 18 2002

In re Application of :
ROTHMAN et al. :
Application No. No. 09/509,466 :
Filed: June 13, 2000 :
Attorney Docket No. 196946US-6X PCT :

DECISION
ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition, filed April 11, 2002 requesting that the prosecution in the above-identified patent application be suspended for a period of six months under 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(a), and an additional six months, pursuant to MPEP § 1002.02(c)9, for a total of twelve months, beginning with the filing of the subject Petition.

Regarding a suspension on request of the applicant, 37 CFR 1.103(a) provides:

- (a) Suspension for cause. On request of the applicant, the Office may grant a suspension of action by the Office under this paragraph for good and sufficient cause. The Office will not suspend action if a reply by applicant to an Office action is outstanding. Any petition for suspension of action under this paragraph must specify a period of suspension not exceeding six months. Any petition for suspension of action under this paragraph must also include:
- (1) A showing of good and sufficient cause for suspension of action; and
 - (2) The fee set forth in § 1.17(h), unless such cause is the fault of the Office

In the Request, to establish cause, Petitioner asserts the claims and issues of the instant application are relevant to the claims and issues in at least U.S. Application No. 08/973,019 which Petitioner has appealed. Further, because the appeal of '019 will materially affect the prosecution of the instant application, the instant application should be suspended pending the decision on appeal of '019.

A review of the record indicates the instant application has claims and issues that are relevant to

appealed case '019 . The claims in the instant application and appealed case '019 are both directed toward the particular structure of the high voltage cable. Consequently, since the outcome of appealed case '019 will materially affect prosecution of the instant application, good and sufficient reasons have been demonstrated to warrant suspension of action.

A further review of the record indicates that the petition was timely filed with the Request For Reconsideration and submission on April 11, 2002. As such, the final rejection dated May 24, 2002, was mailed in error and is hereby VACATED.

For the above reasons, the petition to suspend prosecution is GRANTED for a period of up to twelve (12) months starting from the filing of petition, April 11, 2002.

Inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to Richard Seidel at (703) 306-3431.



Richard Seidel, Director
Technology Center 2800
Semiconductors, Electrical and Optical
Systems and Components